

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11-12 have been canceled without prejudice.

### Claim rejections 35 USC § 102

In section 3 of the above referenced Office Action, Claims 1-12 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Schwartz et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5,894,597 (hereinafter, Schwartz). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent Claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

“An apparatus for holding a SIM (subscriber identification module) card for a personal information device, comprising:

a SIM card;

a PCB (printed circuit board) within a single piece back housing of the personal information device;

a SIM connector mounted on the PCB, the SIM connector configured to electrically connect the SIM card to the PCB when the SIM card is engaged with the SIM connector, wherein the SIM connector includes a plurality of contacts and is smaller than the SIM card; and

a single piece SIM card door comprising a plurality of holders disposed on the surface of the single piece SIM card door for releasably holding the SIM card in the proper position and further configure to hold the SIM card when the single piece SIM card door is in the open position, the single piece SIM card door configured to move the SIM card into engagement with the SIM connector when in a closed position.”

Schwartz discloses that to assemble the chip card support to the door, the fingers of the hands are pinched together and inserted into the anchors and retainers. (See Schwartz, col. 4, lines 43-50). As such, Schwartz is directed to a

door that has a detachable chip card support that in turn holds the SIM card. Thus, Schwartz is not directed to a single piece door holding the SIM card but rather directed to a detachable chip support holding the SIM card. Accordingly, Schwartz requires manufacturing a separate component, a detachable chip card support that mounts on the door and holds the SIM card. Since Schwartz requires manufacturing an additional component and mounting on the door, it is directed to a more complex and more expensive mechanism.

Independent Claim 1 distinguishes over Schwartz by reciting a single piece SIM card door for releasably holding the SIM card. Schwartz on the other hand is directed to a detachable chip card support that mounts on the door. Accordingly, Schwartz does not disclose a single piece SIM card door for releasably holding the SIM card, as claimed.

Moreover, the above referenced Office Action points to Figures 2 and 4 in Schwartz to show that SIM connector is smaller than the SIM card. The Applicants do not understand Schwartz to disclose this limitation. First, the Applicants have found no references in the specification of Schwartz disclosing that SIM connector is smaller than the SIM card. Second, Applicants respectfully assert that although the angle of view for contact assembly 106 and a chip card 101 are different, the mentioned components are roughly equal in size as shown in Figure 2. Finally, Applicants respectfully assert that Schwartz does not disclose that Figures are drawn to scale. As such, Schwartz does not disclose

SIM connector includes a plurality of contacts and is smaller than the SIM card,  
as claimed.

Accordingly, Schwartz does not disclose a single piece SIM card door for  
releasably holding the SIM card, nor does Schwartz disclose SIM connector  
includes a plurality of contacts and is smaller than the SIM card, as claimed.

Thus, independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Schwartz under 35 U.S.C.  
102(b). As such, allowance of independent Claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Independent Claims 6 and 17 are similar in scope to that of independent  
Claim 1 and are therefore patentable over Schwartz at least for the same  
reasons that independent Claim 1 is patentable. Dependent claims include the  
limitations of their independent claims respectively and are each patentable over  
Schwartz, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), at least for the same reasons that their  
independent claims are patentable. As such, allowance of Claims 1-10 and 16-21  
is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and  
withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims 1-10 and 16-21 is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-10 and 16-21 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-10 and 16-21 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Dated: Feb 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Amir A. Tabarrok  
Registration No. 57,137

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile